

# The Michigan Department of Education's Proposed Draft Request for ESEA Flexibility: The Four Principles



## 1. Career- and College-Ready Expectations for All Students

- a. The State Board of Education adopted career- and college-ready content standards in June 2010 by adopting the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in Mathematics and English Language Arts.
- b. The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) is a governing state in two consortia to develop rigorous assessments based on the CCSS: The SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium and Dynamic Learning Maps (alternative assessments).

## 2. State-Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support

- a. Goals:
  - i. Improve academic achievement for all students
  - ii. Close achievement gaps
  - iii. Increase the quality of instruction
- b. Components:
  - i. Set ambitious and achievable annual measurable objectives
    1. Set the initial goal (2011-12 through 2013-14) for all schools for each grade level and content area at the current (2011-12) level of average-performing schools (50<sup>th</sup> percentile)
    2. Set the goal for 2021-22 for all schools for each grade level and content area at the current (2011-12) level of high-performing schools (90<sup>th</sup> percentile)
    3. Keep the goal the same for the first three years, then require equal growth (adequate yearly progress, or AYP) toward the 2021-22 goal each year thereafter
  - ii. Identify and recognize Reward Schools
    1. Three identification strategies (with overlap among the strategies):
      - a. Beating the Odds
      - b. Top 5% of schools on the Top-to-Bottom (TTB) list
      - c. Top 5% improvement rates
    2. Recognition provided:
      - a. Indication on the school's annual education report
      - b. Press releases and media coverage
      - c. Recognition at MDE- and Ed Org- sponsored conferences
      - d. Visits by top-ranking state officials
      - e. Audio/video documentary profiles
      - f. Increased flexibility in using grant funds
    3. A school is not eligible for reward status if identified as a Priority or Focus School or if the school does not make AYP.
  - iii. Identify and support Priority Schools
    1. Schools identified as the lowest 5% on the TTB list
    2. Supports provided:
      - a. Reform/redesign plans based on one of four intervention models (Restart, Transformation, Turnaround, Closure)
      - b. Interventions and professional development specifically focused on supporting the learning of students with disabilities, English learners, and/or other student subgroups (as need is indicated)

- c. School Support Teams, Instructional Leadership Coaches, Content Coaches
  - iv. Identify and support Focus Schools
    - 1. 10% of schools identified as having the largest achievement gap
      - a. Achievement gap is defined as gap in performance between the top 30% of students and the bottom 30% of students
      - b. The bottom 30% of students constitutes one “subgroup” in lieu of multiple subgroups
    - 2. Supports provided:
      - a. District Improvement Facilitator
      - b. Interventions and professional development specifically focused on supporting the learning of students with disabilities, English learners, and/or other student subgroups (as need is indicated)
      - c. Tiered systems of support to target individual student learning needs, tutoring, and/or research-based interventions
  - v. Support additional Title I Schools

### **3. Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership**

- a. Legislation passed in 2011 requires “rigorous, transparent, and fair” performance evaluations for all teachers and administrators beginning September 1, 2011. The evaluations must:
  - i. Evaluate performance at least annually
  - ii. Use data on student academic growth as a significant factor (25% in 2013-14; 40% in 2014-15; and at least 50% by 2015-16 and thereafter)
  - iii. Rate educators as Highly Effective, Effective, Minimally Effective, or Ineffective
  - iv. Provide ample opportunities for improvement
  - v. Be used to inform promotion, retention, professional development, tenure, and certification decisions
- b. The Governor’s Council on Educator Effectiveness will make recommendations to the Governor, Legislature, and State Board of Education no later than April 30, 2012 regarding:
  - i. A student growth and assessment tool
  - ii. A state evaluation tool for teachers
  - iii. A state evaluation tool for administrators
  - iv. A process for evaluating and approving local evaluation tools for teachers and administrators

- 4. Reducing Duplication and Unnecessary Burden:** The MDE, in collaboration with various shareholders and professional organizations, identified unnecessary and/or burdensome state-required reports for elimination in 2011.

*Comments and feedback via email throughout the waiver request process are encouraged and accepted via email at [ESEAFlexibility@michigan.gov](mailto:ESEAFlexibility@michigan.gov).*